

COBBETT'S WEEKLY POLITICAL REGISTER.

Vol. XIII. No. 14.]

LONDON, SATURDAY, APRIL 2, 1808.

[PRICE 10D.]

"As to the Petition, of which the Sheridans' advertisement talks, nothing can be a more gross deception. There is no foundation for a petition; there is even no pretended foundation. The Sheridans well know, that it is impossible for any candidate to observe the laws of election more strictly than Lord Cochrane has observed them. He despises, as all his friends do, the base and contemptible attempt here made to cast an aspersion upon his character. The whole is an impudent attempt at imposition. It is a trick whereby to get money to be pocketed by the parties. Let the contrivers be prepared, however, for a revival of the subject."—POLITICAL REGISTER, Vol. XI. page 975.

513]

SUMMARY OF POLITICS.

WESTMINSTER ELECTION.—At the place, in the Register, above referred to, beginning at page 973, is the whole history of the promised Petition against Lord Cochrane's return, which petition has now seen its end. It will be remembered, that, just after the Westminster contest was over, there was a meeting called, by the Sheridans and their friends, through the means of a public advertisement; that, at this meeting, the celebrated Mr. JOHN FROST was a leading man, and that his health was given as a toast, by the elder Sheridan at one time, and by the celebrated PETER MOORE at another time; that, at the aforesaid meeting, of which Peter was chairman, it was resolved to raise money, by public subscription, for the purpose of prosecuting an appeal to parliament against the return of Lord Cochrane; and, it is well known to all those who had an opportunity of hearing the language of the Sheridans and their friends, at that time, that they, in the most unreserved manner, asserted, that they were able to prove, that Lord Cochrane had been guilty of bribery, and that they stated one particular instance, wherein he gave an elector the sum of two guineas for his vote. I have referred to the passage, wherein I contradicted these assertions, in print; but, so well had the base tricksters, the green-room gang of impostors, the vile herd of diverting vagabonds; so well had they devised their scheme of calumny, and so industrious had they been in the execution of it, that, almost every person, with whom one spoke upon the subject, appeared to believe, that Lord Cochrane would be ousted in consequence of the petition. Nay, to such an extent did this belief exist, that some of the Electors have had several meetings, in order to come to a resolution respecting the nomination of a person to be chosen in the room of Lord Cochrane, the writ for which they expected about the tenth day of this present month of April. Just as all this

[514

was going forward, out came the following laconic report of the proceedings in the House of Commons, touching the matter in question. On Thursday, the 24th of March, "The Speaker informed the House, that, as Tuesday last had been appointed for taking into consideration the petition complaining of the last election and return for Westminster, and the right hon. Richard Brinsley Sheridan had not appeared by himself, his counsel, or agents, within one hour after the time fixed for taking the same into consideration, he had certified such default to the Court of Exchequer, in order to the recovery of the recognizances."—Thus has ended this long promised petition; thus are the green-room impostors exposed, for the thousandth time, to public contempt; and thus are the calumnies, invented and propagated for the purpose of blasting the character of an honourable man, thrown back in the teeth of those from whom they had proceeded. But, it is right that the now undeceived public should be informed of some of the silent proceedings of Messrs. Sheridan, Frost, and Moore, a trio not, perhaps, to be matched in his Majesty's dominions.—In the business of the election, Messrs. DAWSON and WRATISLAW of Warwick Street, Golden Square, were Lord Cochrane's agents. Mr. Wratislaw, to whom the business relating to the petition was more particularly committed, always was of opinion, that the Sheridans, notwithstanding the important support of the celebrated John Frost, would not proceed to trial, and, therefore, he delayed, till the last moment, the consultation of counsel. On Saturday, however, previous to the day appointed for the ballot, he delivered his briefs to Mr. Dallas and Mr. Warren. On the next day (Sunday), the celebrated John Frost, and, after him, his most worthy associate, Peter Moore, addressed very civil notes to Mr. Dawson, who, of course, delivered them to Mr. Wratislaw, and the latter expressed

R

his resolution not to suffer a compromise upon any account, notwithstanding his very exalted opinion of the powers of the celebrated John Frost. On the Monday ensuing Mr. Wratishaw called upon the worthy Peter Moore, he (Moore) being confined by indisposition; and, at a conference with Moore and Frost, it was proposed by them, that Mr. Moore should be the nominee of his friend the Right Honourable Richard Brinsley Sheridan; that he should arrange with the nominee of Lord Cochrane in striking the committee; that the petition should be opened; that the counsel for the Right Honourable Sheridan should say, *that facts existed to warrant it, but that witnesses were absent*; and that the committee would, thereupon, report to the House, that Lord Cochrane was duly elected, and that the petition was *NOT frivolous and vexatious*. But, Mr. Wratishaw, who felt, doubtless, that the honour of Lord Cochrane (who had reposed implicit confidence in him) was an object of far greater consequence than the seat in parliament, though for the first, and the only independent, city in the kingdom, refused all compromise, and left the celebrated petition framers to pursue their own course. On the day appointed, he attended the House of Commons with Messrs. Dallas and Warren; and, after waiting the whole hour out, heard the order discharged. The subsequent proceeding against the petitioner and his sureties the reader is informed of; and, I think, he will be of opinion, with me, that if ever forfeiture was justly incurred, this is a case of that description.—There never was a fouler calumny than that which these people have propagated against Lord Cochrane. His Lordship was particularly scrupulous with respect to the money-matters of the election. He said to his agents: “you know what is lawful, and “what is not lawful, therefore, to you and “you only, I leave the expenditure.” He emptied his pockets of all money, and of no repast, paid for by him, or his agents, did he suffer any one elector to partake. A more honourable, and more truly noble-minded man, does not, in my opinion, exist in the world. His life has been hitherto spent in scenes, which tend little to qualify a man for the wars of faction; but, if he return in health, and with a disposition to remain in England, the electors of Westminster, if they will be content without the base flatteries of the green-room, and will look to character and principles instead of to names and professions, will, I am satisfied, have no need to go a-hunting for representatives.—It has been said, and is

still said by many, that Lord Cochrane was *sent off* by the ministers; that is to say, that a ship was given him for the purpose of getting him out of the way; and, I perceive, that Mr. Paull, in a letter of his to the Electors of Westminster, upon the subject of the grant to the family of Lord Lake, has been misled so far as to join in the propagating of this notion, than which it is impossible to conceive any thing more false. The ship, the frigate *IMPERIEUSE*, in which his lordship now is, and in which he has recently performed a feat that would have rung through all Europe, had it been performed by any but an English naval officer, was given him about *two years ago*; previous to, and during the time of the Westminster election, he was absent by leave, on account of ill-health, which every one who saw must have perceived that he laboured under; and, when his leave of absence was expired, he went again to sea, as a matter of course, and, indeed, as a matter of necessity, unless he had chosen to quit the service, a step, which, upon no occasion, did he ever promise to take; nor did he, upon any occasion, as far as I have observed, say any thing, tending to encourage an expectation that he would take such a step.—The elder Sheridan took almost daily opportunity, during the election, to attribute the promotion, or, rather, the marked preference, which Lord Cochrane had experienced, to parliamentary interest, that is to say, to *corruption*. But, surely, the *distinguished merit* of my Lord Cochrane; not his great bravery, perhaps, for that is common, I think, to all our naval officers; but his consummate and well-known skill in all the parts of his profession; his exemplary sobriety; his indefatigable application; that spirit of enterprize which has constantly animated him, and the effects of which have been so grievously felt by the enemy: surely these might account for his having had, though a young man, a cruising station so often allotted him, a station for which his qualities and endowments so eminently fitted him. He has had admirable “*luck*,” they say. Such men as his lordship generally have admirable luck, as have also sober and early-rising and intelligent farmers. Such men have always better crops than the common run of their neighbours; their cattle thrive better; and, strange to say, they have finer weather for their seed-time and harvest. It is the same by sea as it is by land. There are, indeed, such things as *accidents* and *misfortunes* and *ill-luck*; but, the sluggish have their share of these as well as the active, and the former have, besides, to submit to the natural con-

sequences of their sluggishness. A ship is a sort of animate being, moved by the mind of the commander; and, if he be a sluggard, no matter from what cause, his ship will do but little. In this view of the thing, of how much importance is it, that a proper selection of commanders, and particularly of *cruizing* commanders, should be made?—Where, indeed, it would be difficult, if not impossible, as in the case of the younger Sheridan, to point out any public merit, then, the preference given to the party may be fairly attributed to corruption; but, not so in the case of my Lord Cochrane, who has devoted his life to the naval service, and who may be cited as a striking example of success, arising from his merits.—As a member of parliament, too, he has merit far surpassing that of almost any other man that I know. He entered the House of Commons under a pledge, given in the face of the nation, that he never would, as long as he lived, accept of any sinecure or emolument, either for himself or any relation or dependent; and that he never would touch the public money, in any way but that of his profession as a naval officer. His motion respecting places, pensions, and emoluments, held by members of the House of Commons, or by their relations, was of the greatest public importance; it required courage as great as any that he ever displayed at sea, to bring it forward; he was sure to have an unaccountable host against him; he was sure to leave scarcely any man or woman of fashion his friend; yet he did bring it forward, and did most excellently expose the corrupt views of the contending factions. One would have thought, that, if there had been some few of the electors of Westminster who sincerely distrusted his public principles, that the bare making of this motion must have done away their distrust; but, amongst men, who are capable of being cajoled by the fulsome flattery of the green-room, little good is to be expected.—After all, however, I should certainly have preferred a member, who could have been constantly in the House of Commons, where, and where only, good is to be done, if it be to be done at all; but, I greatly prefer Lord Cochrane's appearance there once in two years, to the constant attendance of any unprincipled or timid man.

AMERICAN STATES.—In a person, whose opinions and statements have been contradicted with so much positiveness and ceremony, as mine, with regard to the effects of war upon the American States, it might reasonably be permitted to indulge a good deal in the producing of proofs, as they pre-

sent themselves, of the correctness of those opinions and statements. Nor will I pretend, that I am not actuated, in great part, by this motive, in making the extracts, which I am now about to insert from the late American newspapers. I love to see my opinions confirmed by events, and who does not, especially when they have been treated with contempt and ridicule? In answer to all the alarm, which the *Morning Chronicle* and the *Barings* and the *Roscoves* have been endeavouring to excite in the minds of the people, relative to a war with America, I have said, and, I think, proved, that, without utter ruin to the union of America, *she cannot make war against England*. She is not yet at war; she is at peace, but has adopted *one* of the measures, the effects of which would have been produced by war; and now let us hear, from her own lips, what a state she has been placed in by this one measure.—The first extract I shall take comes from the *New York Evening Post* of the 5th of February. “*Look here upon this picture.*”—A late Vice President of the United States tried for treason. The Chief Justice accused by the executive of mal-administration of the laws. A senator under trial for being a party in the treason. The commander in chief under trial on a charge of being a Spanish Pensioner. The writ of Habeas Corpus destroyed. The civil magistrate put down; not with impunity alone, but applause, by a military commander! The country on the eve of war with Great Britain, with France, and with Spain! The nation driven to an act of suicide by the embargo, passed by a republican congress, and to use the mildest reproach, without knowing why or wherefore. The nation weighed down with calamity, and imploring in vain to know the reason. The ruthless hand of destruction upon them, and every one reviled who does not applaud it! They look for reasons, and they are told of confidence! We ask for bread and they give us a stone! From such liberty and such republicanism good Lord deliver us!”—Yet, observe, reader, that I have been set down for an *enemy of liberty*, because I expressed my abhorrence of the American government. Will my accusers believe what the Americans themselves say of this their famous liberty? I know them to be the slaves of mean upstart pettifogging lawyers, with here and there a 'cute bleeding doctor; but, if you will not believe me, will you believe themselves? Or do you choose to set them down as liars, because they confirm what I have

said?—The next extract is from a New England paper, the *Connecticut Courant*. “*Merchants* stand idle in the streets, inquiring if there is any news from Washington. They feel the loss of their business; the stagnation of commerce, and ask what does all this mean?—The *Mechanic* is obliged to dismiss his journey-men—his customers desert him, or call to tell him they cannot pay him on account of the embargo.—The *Farmer* finds no market for his produce. His notes given for land will be due in the spring. To raise money, his oats, hay, and corn, were to be sold, but nobody will buy.—The poor *Sailor*—generous, honest, and unsuspecting, lies on his oars. His last shilling is gone to aid a distressed shipmate, and there is not a shot in his locker. Poor fellow—he “wants but little, nor that little long,” but he can’t understand why the ship’s aground—All—all are exclaiming what do all these things mean? Congress have laid an embargo. They have bound their fellow-citizens, hand and foot. They will not condescend to tell the people their reasons for this measure, so important, so unexpected, so pregnant with mischief.—People of America—look at your situation—ask your leaders of both parties why the times are so changed? You love your country—you seek her true interest—you will submit patiently to the losses for the good of the public; but you wish to know what great benefit is to be derived from the embargo? You ask in vain. All is silence and darkness. You are commanded by the administration to submit. Indeed passive obedience and non-resistance is your *only duty*.—My countrymen; be not deceived. If the embargo originated in wisdom, it will bear a strict examination—there should be no secrets on a subject so deeply interesting to the prosperity of the people—there can be no good reasons for silence and darkness.—Legislatures may applaud this measure, but the people want something more substantial than the applause of hirelings before they acquiesce.”—Did I not say, that this would be the case? Did I not give my reasons for saying so? And did not the *Morning Chronicle* and its herd of American writers abuse me for so saying? Did they not threaten us that America would starve the West Indies, and did I not answer, that she must starve herself first?—I said, besides, in case of war, pray shut up the Americans, and proclaim, that any State which will openly throw off the authority of the

President and his government, shall have free trade. Let any one read the following article, and then say, whether my advice was not good.—“In Marblehead, that wonderfully patriotic town, there has been something very much like mobbing. The fishermen collected in a body to the number of two or three hundred, set all the bells a ringing, and paraded through the streets; then repaired to the stores of those merchants who supply the fishermen, and take their fish, demanded pay for the fish, or the value in such articles as they wanted. On being told it was not possible to pay them, and the fish were on hand and could not be sold, and that they were not able to supply them with the articles they demanded, the fishermen entered the stores and took such articles as they could find, allowing the owners to take an account of them. It is said some opened desks and took money.—They went to the wharfs and seized wood, which they divided among them and carried it to their houses. The leading democrats took great pains to quiet them, and hush up the matter, to prevent its going abroad. We are told the fishermen at Cape Ann are about to take the same course. There they are almost to a man democrats. Before next May these fishermen, as well as a numerous class of mechanics, must be in real distress. The Supplementary Embargo Bill, permitting the fishermen to go out, will afford little or no relief, for the fish will be of no value when taken, nor will the owners of vessels fit them out. We are told that good fish which were selling at 3½ and 4 dollars per quintal, can now be bought for 1 dollar and 50 cents per quintal, and few that will purchase at this price.”—Marblehead is a sea port town in the State of Massachusetts Bay. The wharfs are the receptacles for fire-wood, brought down the rivers and along the coast. The fish was generally sent to the West Indies, to Portugal, Spain, and up the Mediterranean. The fishermen are very numerous, and, without a market for their fish, they must nearly starve, forming, as they do, no inconsiderable part of the whole of the community in that district; and, let it be observed, that, if they do not export, they have no market at all. There is no large community to come and take the fish off their hands. All is stagnant at once. The effect is as sudden as that of a hurricane.—In various parts of these newspapers, we have descriptions of failures in trade and credit. Four banks

shall have the following my advice ahead, that there has been mobbing, body to the red, set all led through the stores of the fisher- banded pay such articles and it was not the fish were d, and that them with fishermen such articles owners to It is said oney.— and seized ong them ses. The pains to matter, to e are told e about to ey are al- e. Before well as a ust be in tary Em- ermen to relief, for en taken, fit them sh which per quin- ollar and that will rblehead lassachu- ceptacles vers and generally l, Spain, shermen market starve, siderable unity in d, that, o market unity to ds. All sudden os parts tions of e banks

stopped payment. The newspaper of Norfolk, in Virginia, that scene of infamous treatment towards our naval officers, says: However incredible it may appear, we have it from good authority that Major Lee, a Notary Public of Charlestown, made lately 1200 dollars in the course of one day by protesting notes!!!"—To I will add the petition of 269 seamen to the Mayor of Baltimore, in Maryland: Your petitioners sheweth, that by reason of the embargo, they are reduced to the necessity of applying to your Honour for relief. Many of us are now in arrears to our landlords, and our prospects are bad, as we are incapable of gaining a support by any other means than by our profession as seamen. We humbly pray of your Honour to assist us in this our distressed situation, and your petitioners, as in duty bound, will for your Honour and for the prosperity of the Port of Baltimore always pray."—From petitioning they will come to demanding, and then, like the fishermen of Marblehead, they will proceed to robbery and open seizure. In short, anarchy stares the government full in the face, and that, too, at the same time, and from the same cause, *that the sole source of public revenue is totally dried up.* And, this is the nation that was to bully England! This is the nation who joined the French and the vassals of the Czar of Muscovy in toasting "the liberty of the seas!" This is the nation, at the sound of whose hostile voice the English trident was to be hidden under those waves, which, for so many ages, it had defied! This is the nation, whose chief had the audacity to demand of us the surrender of our right to search for our own seamen, and to whom, it is but too evident, the late ministers would have made that surrender! Think, we shall have peace, and a lasting peace, with America; but, if we have, it will be owing *wholly* to the resolution which the ministers have demonstrated, not to yield to their demands: for, I know their position well, and I most seriously declare my belief, that, if suffered to proceed from demand to demand, they would not cease until they came to demand the crown from the king's head.—We have here an example (the like of which is not unfrequently met with amongst individuals) of a nation, brought to the brink of destruction merely by its arrogance and insolence. It stood in defiance of no concession from us; it was carrying on a third part of the commerce of the whole world, notwithstanding the exercise of our maritime rights. It was fast increasing in wealth and population. It was happy, if

it could have known its place. But, it must needs be a great nation; it must needs have its disputes; it must needs talk big; it must needs show the world that it could be insurmountable; when it thought the old lion was expiring, it must needs come with its hoof.—Mr. A. B. of the Morning Chronicle (that is, I suppose, Mr. *Alexander Baring*) told us about the danger to be apprehended from the failure of supplies of *corn* from America. Mr. YOUNG (and I thank him for it) has told us, that the corn we get from thence was not worth mentioning; and, I beg the reader to observe, that, with all the ports of all the corn-countries in the world shut against us, and at the end of five years of war, indeed, fifteen years, with only ten months exception, *wheat is sixteen pounds a load*, and has not risen in price, in consequence of the stopping up of the channels of importation. But, as I told Mr. A. B. before, America cannot exist without the importation of *rum, sugar, and woollens*. These things the people will have, or they will destroy the government. The *whole* of the revenue of the state arose from a tax upon goods imported. This is gone. *All gone.* It cannot return but with a state of peace; and, I leave the reader to guess, whether it is likely to collect internal taxes from merchants and farmers and fishermen, whose affairs are in the state described in the above quoted paragraphs.—The embargo, which has produced such alarming symptoms in America, seems to have had very little effect in this country, which that embargo was intended to punish. You hear no one crying out for want of credit or of employment. The American embargo is scarcely ever mentioned, any where; and, I'll engage, that, out of the fifteen millions of people, in England, Ireland, and Scotland, there are not more than half a million, who, at this moment, know that there is an embargo in America. Mr. Roscoe, indeed, and his rabble of merchants and car-men at Liverpool, to the number of *three thousand*, it seems, have met and petitioned about peace, introducing, at the end of a long string of unmeaning flummery about "attachment to his Majesty's person and family," an expression, relating to America, that bespeaks a mind of mere childhood. They say: "trusting that, by a firm and dignified, but, at the same time, conciliatory conduct towards hostile and neutral states, your Majesty will be enabled not only to maintain the yet unbroken relations of peace and amity with a power nearly connected with us by the ties of common origin, and an advantageous commercial intercourse, but to restore at

"an early period, to your faithful subjects, and to the world at large, the blessings of a secure and lasting peace." A tolerably well-rounded sentence; but what is the sense of it? If they are not hypocrites; if they do, as they say they do, *rely* upon "his Majesty's wisdom and justice and paternal regard for his people," why this petition? Had they, indeed, said that they thought the king ill-advised, and that they hoped he would listen to them, and alter the course he is at present going on in; then there would have been some sense in what they said. What signifies their coming with all manner of praises in their mouths, and with ten-times-repeated assurances of their attachment to the king, not forgetting their readiness to sacrifice their lives and fortunes in *defence of his person and family*? He must have laughed heartily at this petition, if he ever read it, or heard it read. Silly stuff! I wonder how any man, having the smallest pretension to understanding above that of the mere well-dressed rabble, should have been induced to put his name to it. Why this eternal profession of attachment to the king's person and family? Why this upon all occasions? There may be occasions when such professions are proper, and even necessary: in an address, for instance, at a time when a plot against the king's person, or family, may have been discovered; at a time when treason, or insurrection, is on foot; at a time when invasion is hourly expected; but, what in all the world have such professions to do with the concerns of a shipper of goods, or those of a callico-printer? Yet none of these people can send up a representation of their sufferings, real or pretended, unaccompanied with expressions of the most tender personal regard for the king, which, to say nothing of the flagrant hypocrisy of such expressions, discover a vanity truly disgusting. The silly fellows seem to conceit, that they become exalted by the act of *writing to the king*. Like Justice Shallow, they appear to think, that they are, all at once, made relations of the royal family. Their vanity gets the better of their anger, and, instead of a bitter complaint, up comes a mawkish panegyric upon the king and constitution.—What I chiefly intended to notice, however, was Mr. Roscoe's (for he is said to have drawn up the petition) fine notion about "*the ties of common origin*," which so nearly connect us with America. Now, either this was intended as an argument to induce the king to adopt a more conciliatory conduct towards America, or it must be regarded as a mere expletive, as words thrown in for the mere purpose of making the sen-

tence what Mr. Roscoe regarded suitably long. If the former, I would ask Mr. Roscoe, whether he be informed of any one instance, of any one expression or act, whereby the Americans have testified towards England, *their* respect for those "*ties of common origin*," which he pretends now connect the two countries? Those who are connected by ties of common origin, generally discover a love for each other by mutual acts of kindness, which they do not, in the same way and degree, shew towards the rest of the world. None of these acts has America ever been able to bring herself to adopt with regard to England. She has, on the contrary, constantly shown a partiality for the enemies of England. The misfortunes of England have always been a subject of openly expressed joy from one end of her States to the other; and the good fortune of England has been with her a subject of sorrow, not less openly and generally expressed. Nay, such is the idea which the Americans have of those tender ties of common origin, of which the sage Mr. Roscoe speaks, that they, in order to obliterate even the memory of that origin, have devised for themselves a *tutelary saint* of the savage race, named, from God knows what cause, SAINT TAMMANY! And, they keep the anniversary of this *saint*, in the same manner that the Irish and Scotch keep the anniversaries of St. Patrick and St. Andrew, and that the English, when abroad, keep that of St. George. At this festival they repeat *Odes* in praise of themselves (all of their own making); they sing songs, through their nose; they smoke large twists of tobacco, after the fashion of the savages; and they get as drunk as ever St. Tammany or any of his forefathers did. In a day or two after, you see all their three or four hundred newspapers filled with a detail of the proceedings of the folly-stricken wretches, and you are sure to find, that, at each meeting, there has been one or more curses unanimously bestowed upon England. And yet Mr. Roscoe would fain persuade the King, that, in his conduct towards America, he ought to bear in mind, "*the ties of common origin* which connect the two countries." Verily this is a very silly politician, though he has written a most elegant and most excellent poem. The truth is, that the revolution of America was injurious to its people in various ways; but, in no way so much as in that of depriving them of *an ancestry*. Man not only looks forward, not only desires to live in his children or in his fame, and both if possible; but, he looks back, and desires to have lived in his forefathers; he desires to have a father, or a

grandfather
character of
at least, he
he desires
which he
he can say
tural prop
appears to
for ancie
which the
They are
out renov
have no
to point
nothing
fame of
think, h
want of
has been
the comm
feel the
speaking
ry saint
have dis
want of
miserabl
to see a
up arms
demand
of an o
his cou
plough.
the A
Englan
the sam
They h
old na
revolut
place.
there v
ment o
the pr
deeds,
of virtu
cause
then
and, v
tect u
contin
said t
"Yo
"ha
"Yo
"Yo
"na
"ha
"up
"w
"le
able
of t

grandfather, or a great grandfather, of whose character or whose deeds, or whose existence at least, he can speak of; not having neither, he desires a country of long standing, to which he can say he belongs, or from which he can say he is descended. Of all the natural propensities of the human mind no one appears to be more general than a veneration for ancient things. This is a feeling, of which the Americans have been deprived. They are a nation without forefathers, without renown, and without a history. They have no monument of antiquity, to which to point; no memorial of past events; nothing round which to rally; no name, fame, or character to preserve. This, I think, has been the great cause of that total want of principle, which, every one says, has been creeping in upon them ever since the commencement of the revolution. They feel the deprivation of which we have been speaking, and, in their invention of a tutelary saint and the Order of Cincinnati, they have discovered their desire to supply the want of what they have lost. But these are miserable inventions. It is a vile mockery to see a fraudulent shop-keeper, who took up arms for the purpose of resisting the first demands of his creditors, assuming the name of an old Roman, who, after having saved his country in war, returned again to the plough. These tricks do not satisfy even the Americans themselves. They hate England, because she has all her greatness the same as she had before their revolution. They hate, in a less degree, the whole of the old nations of the world. They rejoice at revolution and destruction, wherever it takes place. If their wish were accomplished, there would be left in existence no establishment of more than twenty years standing; the pride of ancestry, the example of noble deeds, the records of genius, of wisdom, and of virtue, would all be annihilated.—The cause of their malice towards England lies, then, very deep. It is not to be removed; and, we have nothing but our *power* to protect us against the hostility, which will be continually therefrom arising. I have often said to them: "You are free, as you say. You boast of your triumph over us. Your happy revolution has been accomplished. You have got from us all you asked for. You have, you say, reduced us to a little nation. Well, then, why do you still hate us? why are such pains taken to rear up your imps of children to curse us; why not bestow on us your *pity*, or, at least, your *contempt*?" They were never able to answer me; and the principal cause of their wicked machinations against me,

was, that I perpetually reminded them of the greatness of England, and forewarned them of the consequences of provoking her hostility. They knew that I spoke the truth; and it was because they felt the truth, that they sought revenge.—America has long been boasting of her *population*. It is probable that she now equals England in that respect. But, where is the equality in point of *force*? When they used to remind me, that, in the course of twenty years, they should have a population equal to ours, I always begged them to bear in mind, that salt-petre and charcoal and sulphur and iron and brass and flint and wood were very impotent materials when lying scattered here and there, but, when formed into a cartridge and a musquet, they became formidable means of either protection or destruction; that their nation would still continue to be the scattered materials, and that England would continue to be the loaded musquet. They may *now*, perhaps, recollect some of my sayings; but, I am afraid, the recollection will only tend to harden their hearts, and, not having me within the reach of their cowardly revenge, induce them afresh to persecute my friends, for which persecution the public distresses will, if their embargo continue, supply them with pretences in abundance.

GENERAL WHITELOCKE.—The trial of this gentleman has, for nearly three months past, been, for the public attention, a formidable rival of the motions for papers and of Angelica Catalani. The two former are now at an end; but Angelica, by her continual refreshers to those worthy gentlemen, who instruct the English people, through the columns of the news-papers, appears to be resolved not to let go her hold of the ass's ears. The green room tribe have heretofore been content with puffs in the third person, sometimes singular and sometimes plural; but, Angelica, apparently despising this English sheepishness, boldly comes forward in the first person singular, and claps her name at the bottom of the bulletins, in which she details to the well-dressed vulgar, the rise and progress of all her quarrels and all her tilings: it is quite a mercy that she forbears to go into other particulars.—The General's trial was, I must confess, very little interesting to me. I was glad, that we did not possess Buenos Ayres, and that for the reasons, which I stated at the time; and, though I was very sorry for the loss of the *men*, I was not one of those, who, without any proof, concluded that the fault was wholly in the commander.—As to "*popular clamour*," I do not see that it has had any *undue* effect. That the

popular cry against him was loud and general it is certain; but, so it always is too against a famous robber, or murderer; yet, we do not conclude that the latter is *innocent* for that reason, nor, that he has, when condemned, had an unfair trial. The public will, and ought to, think, upon such subjects, and, it will, of course, express its opinion. —The chief thing to be noticed, is, the deplorable *ignorance of the military profession*, which, it has been made to appear, existed in the army sent on the expedition to South America. But, how can it be otherwise, when we consider the motives, whence, in general, military officers are promoted? If the same system had prevailed in the French army, for the last fifteen years, France, instead of being the conqueror of Europe, would have been parcelled out between the several kings and princes, whom that army has dethroned. —General Whitelocke appears to have acted the part of a *conceited* man; a man full of himself; a man overbearing and vain; but there is not, in my opinion, the smallest room for suspecting him of any evil intention. That his sentence is just is pretty evident; there can be little doubt of his being wholly unfit to serve in the army; and, there can be as little doubt of his being unfit *before*, as well as since, the expedition to South America. —Now that he has *failed*, the question comes, “who selected him for the service?” Some say, *Mr. Windham*; others the *Duke of York*. It is asserted, on one side, that *Mr. Windham* forced him upon the Duke, and, on the other side, that the Duke forced him upon *Mr. Windham*. Both assertions are, I am well assured, false. Who it was that first mentioned his name, as a fit person for the command, I have not heard; but, I have heard, and from very good authority, that the appointment was determined on in consequence of the strongest recommendations, signed by several of the first officers in the military service. This being the fact (and the reader may rely upon its being so), the army has nothing to complain of, at any rate; for, if the choice was a bad one, the fault rests with the army. —There never would have been any dispute as to this point, had it not been for the workings of faction. Those who send out expeditions are by no means answerable for the conduct of the officers. To make a good choice is the duty of those who choose; but, they must, in most cases, be determined by the judgment of others; and, if an officer presents himself recommended by men eminent in the service, the responsibility does certainly lie upon those

who give the recommendation. —In the circular letter, sent, by order of the Duke of York to the army, the passage which expresses his Majesty's consolation upon reflecting, that such disgraces as that of *Buenos Ayres* have never before happened to his army (or words to that amount) gave me great pleasure; for, some how or other, it had, previous to the reading of that letter, run in my head, that there had been, in some instances, affairs of nearly the same sort; and, at the hearing of the intimation of trying General Whitelocke for *his life*, I thought the general might well exclaim, in the language of *Macbeth*, “such things have been done before, and men slept quietly in their beds!” It did seem to me, that I had a faint recollection of an affair, which happened while I was from England, in which a general, after having been beaten in his attempt upon the interior of a country, retreated, with all convenient speed, to the spot where he had first landed, and there entered into a capitulation to evacuate the country in so long a time, and to give up a great number of prisoners, before taken, and elsewhere taken, from the enemy, by whom he had been beaten. I thought I heard of this; but, the circular letter of the Duke of York led me to believe, that it must have been a lie, invented by those sad rogues, the news-paper printers in America; a belief, in which I was confirmed, when I came to reflect, that I never, upon the occasion alluded to, heard of any *court-martial*, or even of any *court of inquiry*; nay, of *no blame* whatever, in any of the abominable and detestable news-papers, who have been so ready to set up a cry upon the present occasion. —I am not at all sorry, observe, for the sentence upon general Whitelocke: I wish, with all my soul, that EVERY one, who has brought disgrace upon the army of England, whether through his cowardice or his stupidity, was. . . . not hanged, or shot; for no man can help being a coward or a fool; no man can help, if such be his weakness, hiding his head, when another looks him full in the face; no man can, if he be half an idiot, help drivelling upon his frill and upon the collar of his coat; but, any man can help wearing a sword and receiving the public money, as a military officer, when he ought to be wheeling a barrow, and to become, himself, as soon as convenient, a wheel-barrow full of carrion. No, not hanged, or shot; but I would have EVERY such man cashiered; because, as his ROYAL HIGHNESS THE DUKE OF YORK says, in his excellent circular letter, the sentence would be “a

“lasting
“which
“the dis
“fided t
“judgme
“their
“right
“with h
Botley

SIR;
proachin
on Engl
sider on
defence
armed p
or, in
under a
ment.
against
of thes
appear
To thi
which
upon
which
subsid
two sy
by wh
nience
when
friend
a con
wher
The

Au
Th
H

P
R
A

N

Th
S
I
S
S

ol
of
h
A

[529]

"lasting memorial of the consequences, to
 "which officers expose themselves, who, in
 "the discharge of the important duties con-
 "fided to them, are deficient in that zeal,
 "judgment, and personal exertion, which
 "their sovereign and their country have a
 "right to expect from officers entrusted
 "with high commands."

Botley, 31st March, 1808.

NATIONAL DEFENCE.

SIR;—As the awful day seems fast ap-
 proaching when England must be fought for
 on English ground, it becomes us to con-
 sider on what principle we are to build our
 defence; that is, whether on that of an
 armed people, or that of a standing army;
 or, in other words, whether as a nation
 under a free, or under an arbitrary govern-
 ment. In this inquiry, we must guard
 against being misled, by a sort of mixture
 of these different systems which there may
 appear to be in our military establishments.
 To this end, we have only to distinguish,
 which of the principles the government act
 upon as fundamental and permanent; and
 which they merely tolerate as collateral and
 subsidiary.—The difference between the
 two systems may be tolerably well illustrated,
 by what has fallen within our own expe-
 rience in the last sixteen years.—France
 when attacked in 1792, had not a single
 friend to draw a sword in her behalf; while
 a confederacy was soon formed against her,
 whereof

	Millions
The Italian States had a population of	13
Austria.....	23
The Netherlands nearly.....	2
Holland and certain German States	
above	7
Prussia.....	8
Russia	36
And England.....	15
Making an aggregate of.....	104

The following States looked on,	
Switzerland with.....	2
Denmark with.....	2½
Sweden with	3
Saxony with.....	2
Portugal with	2
And Spain with	11
Making another aggregate of	22½

France from the then recent fall of the
 old government, and the tottering infancy
 of the new, was, in the imagination of her
 hunters, already divided as a spoil. They
 fondly thought they had only to enter her

territory, and every one to take his appoint-
 ed share in the division. But these politi-
 cians wholly overlooked one material cir-
 cumstance. They totally forgot that, when
 they confederated, France was free. Feeble
 as was her government, unprepared as were
 her people, yet the nation, because of its
 freedom, was radically strong. The con-
 federacy called forth this strength. The
 magnitude of the assault roused all the
 energies of defence. We know the issue.
 And we likewise know, that the present
 ruler, by the splendour of victories, by
 quartering his armies on his enemies and
 auxiliaries, and by flattering the national
 vanity, has preserved in full vigour under
 his military government, that energy which
 originated in liberty.—Now, Sir, when
 France turned upon her pursuers and hunted
 them in her turn, we see on all occasions
 an issue the reverse of that of her own suc-
 cessful defence; and for this plain reason,
 that the invaded nations were not free. We
 have seen all these states in succession, with
 their numerous millions of inhabitants, that
 might have furnished fighting men enow
 to have trampled their invaders under foot,
 completely conquered, and the greatest of
 them in effect no better now than provinces
 of the French empire. It was not until
 after a contest of fifteen years, that a single
 ray of defensive wisdom beamed or rather
 glimmered on the continent, where the em-
 peror Alexander was said to have armed
 600,000 of his subjects, as a volunteer
 militia: but the truth is, these were the
 slaves of the nobles, and were armed with
 the same jealousy, and precisely on the same
 condition, as English ministers have armed
 English volunteers, that is, for the mere
 occasion, and subject to be dissolved again
 in a moment, by a breath from the lips of
 those ministers.—I will not stop to shew
 how, in this respect, ministers have dis-
 obeyed and betrayed the constitution, but
 proceed to remark that the imperial auto-
 crat of all the Russias, with his immense
 standing army, his thirty-six millions of sub-
 jects, and his six hundred thousand volun-
 teers, found his throne endangered by a
 single defeat on the confine of his dominions;
 which obliged him to sign at Tilsit a dis-
 graceful treaty of peace with his enemy.—
 Such are the defensive powers of despotism!
 —Now, Sir, with all this experience before
 our eyes, and with a change of fortune that
 hath thrown into the scale of France above
 one hundred and eight of the aforesaid mil-
 lions of population, to be added to her own
 original numbers, and altogether forming an
 aggregate of full one hundred and thirty

millions, capable of furnishing above twenty millions of soldiers; with all these means, I say, at the command of France, we see English statesmen granting £1,200,000 of our money to Sweden, to a country, whose revenue is perhaps one fifth of our poor's rate, "to put in motion and keep on a respectable establishment her land forces and part of her fleet, particularly her flotilla," for the purposes of her defence, and without bestowing a single thought on the main spring of that defence, meaning the liberties of the people. Surely, Sir, greater insanity than this, never came under the cognizance of a Willis or a Monro!—By a vigorous effort, our government possessed itself of the Danish navy and the Island of Zealand, which, with Norway, is no mean portion of the kingdom; and by certain expressions in the northern correspondence laid before parliament, it should seem as if the king of Sweden was privy to that enterprise. I will not now stop to discuss the morality of that expedition. It seems however pretty generally admitted, that, had it been necessary to our own defence, it would have been justifiable. Taking it then as so considered by our ministers, and with the views which they might possibly take of approaching danger to England from the Baltic, it seems to me that those ministers did not act consistently with their own principles, by allowing the Island of Zealand, which commands one side of the Sound, to return again into the hands of an exasperated enemy.—I am no advocate for tearing a country and its inhabitants by the sword of war from one monarch to strengthen the hand of another; but when, in the course of a war, a nation can be emancipated from the government of a despot, and restored to its antient liberty, such an act of power must always command my admiration. Despotism is a perpetual war of the sovereign on his people, and whenever a favourable opportunity, in the course of a war, presents the means of emancipation, I think they ought to be made use of. If, therefore, when Zealand had come under the power of our government, the English commanders had convened the people, laid before them the model of a free government, for themselves and the Norwegians, offering it to their acceptance, subject to such improvements as they themselves should suggest, I do not believe those Danes and Norwegians would have accused us of having coined a "new morality," or that they would have stigmatized us with any opprobrious names.—As those people must have thought themselves too weak to stand alone, they might have had no objec-

tion to have been united with Sweden, provided the same free form of government that was offered to them should have been extended to the Swedes; and if such a reformation in his state had been acceded to by the gallant Gustavus, I cannot see that there could have been any difficulty in Zealand and Norway, containing about a million of inhabitants, having been added to his dominions; and the hearts of the whole people being united in the common defence; while, with English assistance, Zealand should have repelled any attack that could have been made upon it by the French.—Under such circumstances, and by a training of the whole people to arms, agreeably to the genius of every free government, the continent might yet have beheld a spectacle, to have put to shame the rest of her degenerate sons, and to have covered with infamy those of her sovereigns, who, rather than give liberty to their people, have licked the dust at the foot of a foreign conqueror.—Even in Gustavus's present situation, his case, if he have real wisdom and magnanimity, is not to be despaired of; but it is absurd to suppose, that, if he shall refuse to give his people freedom, his throne either can, or will be defended. If there be an immense disparity of force between him and his enemies, there are great advantages in the situation, and circumstances of his kingdom. With those advantages on his side, and with the naval assistance of England, he would probably frustrate all attempts at his subjugation, provided his people had the same interest as himself in the common defence. He is doubtless in the crisis of his fate; and it is probable we shall shortly see him, either a patriot and triumphant hero, or a miserable pensioner on the bounty of this country; in which latter case we may expect to see both shores of the Sound in possession of Denmark.—This consideration revives in my mind apprehensions I have long entertained, and have on more occasions than one formerly intimated; respecting all the powers of the Baltic being enrolled among the number of our enemies. Nor is this apprehended danger like to come upon us alone, in addition to those we had already to encounter. When the whole coast of continental Europe shall form one uninterrupted line of hostility, with a sea at each extremity into which we cannot enter, our situation will require talents for government and for defence, and virtues for inspiring the people with attachment and confidence, which we have not yet witnessed among any of those who are either possessors of, or competitors for, the power of ruling over us. In any

individ
ed-up en
not favo
if the S
shut ag
within
may be
very nu
they ma
of us.—
Dardan
same ca
Baltic,
hands
pretend
danger
magnit
ration
grasp
ranklin
substa
defence
necess
ticular
practi
corru
Hous
seats
becom
sions
the I
liber
liber
need
be c
bor
pole
ner
wor
sup
tion
I tr
sal
Jo
18

[533]
individual port that we can blockade, a cooped-up enemy is kept in a state of torpidity, not favourable to naval improvement; but if the Sound and the Dardanelles be once shut against us, our enemies will then have within those passages extensive seas, which may be made both nurseries and schools for very numerous bodies of seamen, where they may be trained to naval war in defiance of us.—That we can be shut out of the Dardanelles we know; but whether the same can be done at the entrances into the Baltic, when all the shores shall be in the hands of an energetic enemy, I will not pretend to decide. But at all events our danger from invasion is rapidly growing to a magnitude, not only to demand for the preservation of our country every hand that can grasp a weapon; but a removal of all rankling discontents, by an honest and substantial redress of grievances. To our defence reformation is at length become as necessary, as arms and ammunition. I particularly mean that which includes in it every practicable correction of state abuses and corruptions, namely, a reformation of the House of Commons; far more than half the seats of which it is universally believed are become the private and hereditary possessions, of those who are collectively called the Borough Faction. If this be true, the liberty of our country is lost: and if this liberty shall not be speedily restored, there needs no ghost to tell us, our country cannot be defended.—If we could suppose our borough-holding grandees to desire that Napoleon should have our country, and his generals their estates, their present conduct would be quite consistent. On any other supposition, it is inexplicable. But as national defence is now a subject much studied, I trust its true principles will soon be universally understood.—I remain, Sir, &c.
JOHN CARTWRIGHT.—*Enfield, 20th March 1808.*

ORDERS IN COUNCIL.

SIR,—I am induced by the letter of an American merchant, which appeared in the last number of your Register, to trouble you with a few lines on the point upon which that writer chiefly relies for the support of his argument.—I say, Sir, and I suspect that I know somewhat more of these matters than the American merchant, that the letter which has been so often quoted from M. Decrés to Gen. Armstrong is *no authority at all* for the latter to assume that American vessels were to be exempted from the decree of the 21st Nov. 1806.—I say further that, if Gen. Armstrong knew any thing at all of

the functions of his office, and of the course of transacting diplomatic business at Paris, he must have very well known that the letter he had received from M. Decrés did not invalidate the obnoxious decree. Is it indeed in any way probable that Bonaparté would allow an act of supreme legislation signed by himself, and destined to controul every power in Europe, to be explained away by the crude and unauthorised opinion of his minister of marine? But, Sir, independent of this general argument, it is well known that the minister of marine is not the competent authority from which Mr. Armstrong could receive any official communication on the subject, and, unless M. Decrés stated himself (which he did not) to be writing by order, and in the name of his master, his sentiments were no more conclusive than those of any other individual of whom the American minister might have asked advice.—In fact, M. Decrés was well aware of this, and, at the end of his letter, refers the general for a further and more decisive opinion to the *minister for foreign affairs*. He, of course, did not mean to say that the treaty between France and America would be violated; but as little does he say that the Berlin decree should not be enforced.—Who was the proper organ through which the foreign ministers resident at Paris were to communicate with the French government?—No other than Charles Maurice Talleyrand, yclept Prince of Benevento, and such was the jealousy of the said prince and his master upon this subject that I have known them reprimand the ambassadors of some of their vassal courts for addressing themselves upon occasions of very inferior importance to the heads of other departments.—M. Talleyrand was, as I remember, absent at the time from Paris: but, do you think, Sir, that he did not, on notifying his departure to the corps diplomatique, name the person in his office with whom they were to communicate in his absence? Depend upon it that upon that, as upon other occasions, their communications were to be received by the *Chef de Bureau* in the *Rue du Bacq*, to be decided upon by him, or to be by him forwarded, if the decision was beyond his competence, to the minister himself. Why then was this channel not used, and why was M. Decrés resorted to?—Why, Sir, because M. Talleyrand would either have given no answer at all, and thus have confirmed the Americans' fears, or he must have denied the application of the decree to American commerce and navigation. It was beyond the powers of ambiguity even of a Talleyrand to avoid giving in such a case a

significant, if not a plain answer, to a plain question.—It was, therefore, a convenient expedient to make the minister of another department, write a demi-official letter which you justly observe, says nothing to the main point, thus leaving both parties at liberty to avail themselves of the subterfuge:—the Americans by saying that Decrès's letter served them as an exemption,—the French by maintaining that no such exemption had been granted by any competent authority.—The latter it is clear by the decree from Milan of the 11th December last is the French understanding of the matter, nor has the contrary been maintained. It has never been said that the French acknowledged having exempted the Americans, (Regnier in his report states the direct contrary) only that the latter chose to construe Decrès's letter into an exemption:—with what reason or justice I have already told you.—AN ENGLISHMAN.—London 28th March 1808.

ON WAR.

SIR,——I perceive that you have inserted in your Register of the 12th instant, a paper of mine, dated February the 15th, written in consequence of some observations made by you, in your first letter to Mr. Roscoe, upon the general question of war; which were intended by you as an ethical explanation of the subject, preparatory to subsequent remarks more immediately connected with the politics of the present day. In that paper, with a view of giving as clear a statement of my ideas as I thought was adapted to the importance of the question, I divided the argument into four distinct parts: two of which were employed to prove that a tendency to war, is not, as you have stated, naturally implanted in the mind; but, that it proceeds from a desire of acquiring some object supposed to be capable of affording gratification to the party engaged in the mean of action; which object is to be attained by this mean only, or is, perhaps, more readily to be attained by it, in preference to any other. The third and fourth topics, that remain to be considered, and on which, you will observe, you and I are less at variance than on the former; apply equally to the question originally introduced by you, and are, probably, objects more likely to meet with general attention: I shall, therefore, resume the discussion in the order I set out with.—III. Now, Sir, as I have admitted that a tendency to war exists, but have endeavoured to prove that this tendency is not instinctive; it may, perhaps, appear strange that mankind, in its early state,

should have ever thought of attacking one another, if they had not been guided to it by a natural propensity: and yet, it seems stranger, nay, even more unnatural, that they should have ever thought of respectively arming two bodies of their own species, for the express purpose of murdering each other, as it is called, in cold blood. To consider these acts according to the doctrine, that I have previously maintained, that men are led to fight from the desire of possessing certain objects; it will be necessary to examine into the nature of such objects, in order that we may be enabled to determine upon the third article of my arrangement, viz. the good or evil resulting from a tendency to war, or, the operation of its effects upon society at large.—In the first formation of society, a disposition to war must have been far more general than it is at this time: every man, in fact, became a sort of warrior from absolute necessity; in as far as, without engaging in pursuits of a sanguinary and warlike nature, it was impossible for him to provide the necessaries of life, and to defend himself from beasts of prey. At length, from slaying certain animals to satisfy his hunger, and from sacrificing others to render him more secure; his hands were continually imbrued in blood, and his mind was habitually accustomed to the most disgusting scenes of slaughter and barbarity: the natural ferocity of his temper was increased: his imagination,—from associating the ideas of slaying and of food, the last of which could only be procured through the medium of the first; from anticipating, I say, the enjoyment of the food, not only became reconciled to the slaughter, but took a pleasure in contemplating the act, as preparatory to the gratification of his appetite. In this state, it is not to be supposed that society entertained much sense of right or wrong: their calls were all of them essential, and all of them of the same nature. Is it to be wondered at then, that,—seeing their usual occupation, seeing their dispositions infected with a love of blood, and, moreover, reflecting upon the difficulties they must have encountered to obtain these accommodations, wretched as they were; they should be urged to the destruction of one another, provided, by this step, they were likely to gratify their wants with greater ease, or in greater plenty! From this, it must appear that the *objects*, for which mankind originally fought, were sensual: of which, indeed, a most striking example is presented to us by Garcilasso de la Vega, who makes mention of a nation in South America that went to war with other tribes,

with a view that might wards, con offspring, fattened, rously murdered fathers! S pravity is ens at the the proflig going to t shew that tion, the were mo conducted were less quent. in feudal another; were mo respectiv some pri revenge mode of superior motives so dis: posed to tion, th ty is dis moned egged malice its end other, warfar in use press substit is gre ing of pecial ly cor every ing, army cessa affor it sh pabl ting dera thei thei scen By pea ten of ed it i

[337]

with a view of violating the female captives that might be taken, whom they, afterwards, confined until the delivery of their offspring, which (shocking to relate) were fattened, torn from their mothers, barbarously murdered and eaten by their inhuman fathers! Such an instance of unnatural depravity is scarcely credible: the mind sickens at the thought of it, and is appalled at the profligacy of the race!—But, without going to these extreme cases, it is easy to shew that, as mankind advanced in civilization, the *objects*, for which they fought, were more rational: their wars, by being conducted by persons regularly embodied, were less bloody, less brutal, and less frequent. Heretofore, in this country, when, in feudal times, one lord made war upon another; the objects, they had in view, were mostly selfish, and the lives of their respective vassals were sacrificed to gratify some private passion of envy, jealousy, or revenge; to all of which, by our present mode of warfare, men engaged in battle are superior: and if, as is generally the case, the motives, that induce them to engage, are not so disinterested as they are frequently supposed to be; yet, when they are once in action, the motives are forgotten, magnanimity is displayed, every noble feeling is summoned on the occasion, and, instead of being egged on, as in former times, by personal malice and ill-will, each party strives to gain its end in a manner as little destructive to the other, as it can. Hence, we see that modern warfare has the advantage of that anciently in use: it is better calculated not only to repress the gross passions of mankind, but to substitute noble virtues in their room. This is greatly to be attributed to the *objects* being of a different description; but, more especially, to what is sometimes inconsiderately condemned as a proceeding repugnant to every principle of justice: I mean the fighting, as it were by proxy, in the person of an army. Surely, Mr. Cobbett, if war be necessary, (and, from the experience history affords us, it is unavoidable) it is better that it should be carried on by men who are capable of exercising discretion, of discriminating with judgment, and of acting with moderation; than by others, who blinded by their passion, think of nothing but gratifying their will, and, having lost their reason, descend to a state of intemperate brutality.—By a little farther consideration, it must appear still more evident that our present system of warfare is superior; and the notions of injustice, cruelty, and immorality attached to raising standing armies, whose business it is occasionally to fight, is a vulgar preju-

dice arising from a supposition that if such bodies were not instituted, mankind would live in peace. That this, however, would not be the case, it is humbly presumed, the preceding remarks have shewn: for, if the practice (which is itself one of the refinements of civilization) were abolished; all other improvements would decline: science, trade, and arts, no longer would be protected; and the country, wherein the abolition took place, would be reduced to a state of abject slavery to another power, by which it had not been carried into effect: or, in the event of its being universally adopted, mankind would gradually revert to its original situation of uncultivated ferocity. In aid of this, it need only be observed that civilization results, by degrees, from a spirit of warfare continually kept alive: I say *continually*, because, if the acquirement of the first object (for new objects will arise in order one after the other) be sufficient to subdue that spirit for a time; the nation which is so satisfied will never make any considerable progress: it is liable to relapse, in the interim, to its former state of barbarity, from which, each successive spirit would only be sufficient to recover it to the situation, it had, in the first instance arrived at; whence, it would again decline, and so, alternately, flow and ebb, without advancing one jot beyond the point, it had originally gained. If the Americans before alluded to had kept alive their spirit, instead of kindling it every now and then to gratify their appetites; they would, in the first place, have been better employed, and, in the next, have been made sensible of the criminality of their conduct. By way of example, take into consideration the practice of the Romans; who, in the infancy of their establishment, actuated by revenge, had recourse to a measure in a very slight degree similar, with a view, principally, of resenting an affront, they had received: after having accommodated their differences with the Sabines, a war with whom, their conduct naturally produced; they did not, however, rest at home, in indolent possession of the objects they had acquired; they did not give themselves up to, what might then be called, luxury and ease; but preserved their spirit of military enterprise, and, in the reign of their sixth king, found themselves in a condition to send out an army of 80,000 men. As they advanced in civilization, their military strength increased; so much so, that, in the time of the commonwealth (not long before Hannibal appeared) they were able, comprehending the neighbouring states in alliance with them, to muster, in the invasion made upon them by the Gauls,

700,000 foot, and 70,000 horse; and of themselves, including only Rome and Campania, they could bring into the field, 250,000 foot, and 23,000 horse! At these times, it is reported, Rome was in a higher state of civilization, than at any other respectively preceding them; and in proportion as its military establishment increased, so did the virtue of its people: which proves that a tendency to war, instead of generating immoral actions, and promoting vicious habits, elevates the mind, purifies human nature, and divests it of its sensualities. From which, however, is not to be inferred that a nation, to be prosperous, must always be at war: the objects, for which its spirit should be kept alive, are not so much the extension of its dominion, as the retention of that which it may be possessed of: if vigilance be employed in the proper direction of a tendency to war, few objects will stimulate more powerfully than jealousy of encroachment, either upon the territory itself or upon the privileges of its constitution; and a good government will always be jealous of the movements of its neighbours, whereby, (without being petulant or bickering for trifles) circumstances will occur sufficiently often to give an opportunity of combining practice with the theory. In short, for a nation to be secure in the maintenance of its dignity, and to have the power of prosecuting those measures that will give permanency to its existence; it is absolutely necessary that it should be prepared to resist encroachment, and possess the means of correcting insolence; without resorting, upon every occasion, to the efforts of its people indiscriminately amassed together; by which, the economy of its administration would be deranged, and its progress in refinement unavoidably retarded.—IV. To determine upon the fourth and last point that remains to be considered, viz. the advantages or disadvantages of a tendency to war, when compared with a disposition to peace; it is material to inquire if mankind, in a state of peace, is less averse to the destruction of one another, than in time of open war? In resolving this inquiry, it will be found that the grosser passions (to gratify which, it has been presumed, the spirit of warfare took its rise) are more readily wrought upon and less easily satisfied in peace than in open war: the absence of the nobler virtues, such as courage, fortitude and perseverance, giving in this instance, upon the same principle as in the last, a greater latitude to the will; though, at the same time, preventing its being exercised to the full extent, by fear, weakness, and irre-

solution being substituted in their stead. Hence it is that less real devastation is committed in those nations mostly living in a state of peace, than in others more frequently engaged in war; but, it is to be observed, that, in the former, attempts are often made to sacrifice human life to become possessed of certain objects; the only difference between them being, that, in the latter, open measures are employed (if any are employed at all) to effect the same purposes, which gives the party that is attacked an opportunity of exerting himself in his defence; while, in the other, insidious operations are directed against him, which, in the end, prove equally destructive, but are projected and carried into execution without endangering the aggressor.—That a disposition to peace generates *cowardice* cannot, for a moment, be disputed; and that "*cowardice is the mother of cruelty*," is a position as generally admitted. Of these two facts, we have a prominent instance in the Chinese nation; which has been noticed by you, Mr. Cobbett, as an example of the effects of a people living in an almost perpetual state of peace. So mean and dastardly are their spirits, that, it is recorded by modern historians, the very act of laying hand upon the hilt of a sword is sufficient to make them tremble from head to foot; and he must be a man, the nerves of whose system are of a more firm and tense nature than is ordinarily the case, who can support himself from fainting at an exhibition of the blade! And yet, Sir, this is the nation whose refinement in cruelty, is such, as to display, in its code of penal laws, punishments far more excruciating than are adopted, or even known, in other countries where a disposition to war exists: in addition to breaking upon the rack, they have recourse to hamstringing, burning out the eye-sight with unslaked lime, and many other tortures that are neither fit nor necessary to be spoken of. But, in no instance, is the abominable inhumanity of this people more conspicuous, than in the unnatural sin of infanticide, which is carried to such an extent, that, in the streets of Pekin alone, it is estimated, from two to three thousand babes are annually exposed, to fall a prey, both alive and dead, to the dogs and swine that roam about in search of food! The very few times they have been engaged in war, the same cowardice has displayed itself, and has urged them to extremes as ridiculous as they were pusillanimous: in an account of the invasion of Yecunan, (one of their provinces,) it is reported, the inhabitants were so terrified, that, in order to avoid the enemy, they absolutely hanged and

drowned the
needless to
picable race
Romans, wh
war, raised
plundering
people, who
wonder, an
temporaries
holden up a
ty and valou
fering their
ever; by g
ries of pea
of a warlik
objects suff
arrived at
dominion)
world, this
duced to t
troops to
naturally c
of the em
equally r
same fate
cy to dec
the fift
were und
fence to
sible to p
up arms
which,
ambition
let it be
a tender
is not o
but is e
of a n
the bes
impossi
ting en
expect
univers
fect ha
sidered
that c
hurtful
feeling
my fir
object
over,
ing th
happ
thoug
ly up
men
war
the
join
be i
if t

[541]

drowned themselves for fear!—But it is needless to dwell any longer upon this despicable race: let us take another view at the Romans, who, by means of a tendency to war, raised themselves from a petty tribe of plundering shepherds to a great and wealthy people, who were, at once, the awe, the wonder, and yet the admiration of their contemporaries; and are, even in these days, holden up as an example of fortitude, dignity and valour worthy of imitation. By suffering their military spirit to decline, however; by giving themselves up to the luxuries of peace; and by relinquishing pursuits of a warlike nature (most likely, *for want of objects* sufficiently attractive; for they had arrived at their ne plus ultra, in point of dominion): this nation, this terror of the world, this conquering race of heroes was reduced to the extremity of employing hireling troops to fight its battles, which, as may be naturally expected, led to a total overthrow of the empire. The Greeks (another nation equally renowned, in history) shared the same fate, by suffering their warlike tendency to decline; so that, when attacked, in the fifteenth century, by the Turks, they were under the necessity of leaving their defence to mercenary soldiers, it being impossible to prevail upon a single native to take up arms on the occasion; in consequence of which, they, also, fell an easy prey to the ambition of their enemies.—In short, Sir, let it be considered in which way you please, a tendency to war, under proper restrictions, is not only preferable to a tendency to peace; but is essentially important to the interests of a nation. Even in private society, with the best intentions in the world, it is almost impossible to go through life without creating enemies; and it must not therefore be expected, that a nation, which is an object of universal observation, can long exist in perfect harmony and peace. War, when considered by itself, is, like most other measures that cause the shedding of human blood, hurtful to the mind and repugnant to the feelings; but, as I observed particularly in my first letter, it is not the medium, but the object, that is to be looked at: and, moreover, in support of what I then said, respecting the connexion between virtue and public happiness, it is worthy of remark, that, although the objects, which operate individually upon the respective inclinations of some men, are such as induce them to engage in war from a principle of self interest; yet, the common object to be attained by the joint influence of their exertions, can never be inconsistent with the principles of virtue, if that war be, strictly speaking, “a just

and necessary measure.” It is irrational, then, to inveigh indiscriminately, against war, without examining into the *objects*, for which it is carried on; it is folly to stigmatize it with the cant phrases of modern philosophy, without looking into the principle, upon which it is conducted. Let the object be proved defective; shew its error, and point out a remedy; and if, after this, (no matter whether the issue of the contest turn out favourable or not) war be prosecuted and human life sacrificed; then may it, with great propriety, be called a wanton waste of blood, and a pure, unadulterated evil. That this, very often, is the case, no person can deny; but then, it is not a sufficient reason why the proceeding should altogether be condemned: there are few measures, however excellent in their nature, but are subject to being misapplied, and it not unfrequently happens, that this very excellence in their nature, renders them the more liable to perversion. I am, therefore, Sir, inclined to agree with you perfectly in opinion, that war, generally speaking, is “a good; though, like the greater part of other good things, not unmixed with *evil*.”—I remain, Sir, yours, &c.—W. S. L.—*Holborn, March 19, 1808.*

OFFICIAL PAPERS.

RUSSIA.—*Memorial presented to Count Romanzoff, the Russian Minister for Foreign Affairs, by the English Merchants resident at St. Petersburg, the result of which was the notification by the Count that the Passports required would be granted.—Feb. 28, 1808.*

We, the English Merchants who had the honour of waiting on your excellency on Saturday morning, take the liberty of stating to your excellency in writing certain points of our conversation, to which we are most particularly desirous of drawing the attention of your excellency—Your excellency was good enough to assure us, that our detention here was only a measure of precaution, adopted until information should be received of the manner in which Russian merchants should be treated in England. On this subject, permit us most positively to assure your excellency, that all our advices from England agree in stating, that neither the property nor the persons of Russian merchants are in any way molested; and it is with the utmost deference that we presume to suggest to your excellency, that had such steps been resorted to in England, the sufferers would long since have made known their case to their friends here, and that it must have been communicated to your excellency. Al-

though an embargo was laid on Russian shipping, in consequence of the detention of British ships in this country, yet the lenient measures adopted on that occasion by his Imperial Majesty's government were not without their effect on ours.—We have now certain information, by letters of 22d Dec. (N. S.) that the embargo has not only been taken off, but an Order of Council has been issued, permitting the cargoes of all vessels which may have sailed from the ports of Russia before the 1st of January to be delivered to the consignees, and after receiving their freights, &c. allowing the ships themselves, as in time of peace, to return. We trust your excellency will not consider the adoption of hostile steps by the English government against ships of war and their crews (the obvious and almost necessary consequence of the unfortunate misunderstanding betwixt the two countries), as just cause for detaining the persons of merchants, or other private individuals: and it ought still less to affect us, who, during a long residence in Russia, have endeavoured by loyalty and good conduct, to merit a continuance of that generous protection which we have hitherto enjoyed. We further beg leave to add, that we have discharged every debt, and that in the event of our departure, no inconsiderable property will remain under sequestration. Most of our relatives have ceased to write to us, under the pleasing expectation of soon seeing us, whence our family affairs, which now demand our whole attention, as the sole means of future subsistence, suffer not a little, whilst the absence of all occupation renders us doubly sensible to the painful uncertainty of our situations. —Under these impressions we once more beg to recommend our cause to your excellency's protection; and from the favourable manner in which your excellency was pleased to express your sentiments on the subject, we ventured to persuade ourselves that your excellency will represent our case in such a point of view to the higher powers, as to produce the removal of those obstacles which have so long interposed to prevent our departure.—According to your excellency's permission, we inclose a list of the names of the young men (élèves) in the different counting-houses, to whose peculiar situation we claimed your excellency's attention, and in whose behalf you so kindly promised your interference. We answer for their never having been engaged in commerce, either directly or indirectly.

HOLLAND.—Decree issued by the King of Holland, dated Jan. 24, 1808, relative to the abrogation of the Kniphausen flag.

Louis Napoleon, by the Grace of God and the constitution of the kingdom, King of Holland, and Constable of France,—Pursuant to the actual ratification of the treaty concluded at Fontainebleau, on the 11th of Nov. 1807, by which the Lordships of Kniphausen and Varel, are united to this kingdom, in like manner as the territories which are comprised in the possessions of the princes, constituting a part of the confederacy of the Rhine, we have decreed and do hereby decree as follows:—Art. I. The Kniphausen flag being abrogated in consequence of the union of that territory with this kingdom, shall be no longer recognized, or valid. The consuls and other agents of Count Bentinck, as Lord of Varel and Kniphausen, shall be no longer recognized in the said capacities.—II. All inhabitants of the Kniphausen [and Varel] territories shall be at liberty to carry Dutch colours. They are charged to change the antient colours, which they may have belonging to their vessels, the same being utterly cancelled.—III. All requests made to Count Bentinck, for leave to sail under the ancient flag, shall immediately be sent to our Minister of Finance.—IV. Our Ministers of Finance, of the interior, of Justice and Police, and of Marine, are charged with the execution of the present decree, which shall be made public in all places where it may be deemed necessary.

FRANCE.—A *Senatus Consultum*, of the 19th Feb. 1808, published by order of the French Government, contains the following dispositions.

Art. I. Such foreigners as shall render, or have rendered eminent services to the state, or who possessed particular talents, shall settle in France, and introduce there any useful invention or branch of industry, shall, after twelve months residence, enjoy all the rights of French citizens.—2. This privilege shall be conferred to them by our special decree, by virtue of the report of a minister, after the council of state shall have been heard.—3. A copy of the said decree shall be delivered to the foreigners so naturalized, signed by the grand judge, minister of justice.—4. With this copy he shall present himself before the municipality of the place where he means to reside, and take the oath of obedience to the constitution of the empire, and of allegiance to the Emperor.